

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 8, 14, 21, and 24 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 8, 13-16, 21, 23, 24, 29, and 30 are amended. Claims 36-39 and 41 are hereby canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

In the final rejection dated November 26, 2008, the specification is objected to because of informalities, claims 24-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, and claims 1-39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The outstanding rejections to the claims are respectfully traversed.

Objections to the Specification

In the office action, the specification is objected to because it allegedly contains an embedded hyperlink in paragraphs [0039]-[0040]. While applicants maintain the traversal to this object set forth in the previous submission, in the interest of progressing prosecution, applicants request that the specification be amended as recited herein to address this objection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §112

In the office action, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for lacking antecedent basis for a claimed term. Claim 21 has been amended to address this rejection. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §101

Claims 24-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 24 has been amended to address this rejection. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103

In the office action, claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-21, 23-28, and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,200,680 issued to

Evans *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Evans”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 1, 8, 14, 21, and 24 have been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. These claims disclose receiving **a request from a first user device to share content with a second user device, the request comprising a specific resource locator parameter and a generic resource locator parameter**, wherein the specific resource locator parameter identifies a device-dependent portion of the content, and wherein the generic resource locator parameter identifies a non-device-dependent portion of the content, or elements substantially similar. Applicants respectfully assert that these elements are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art.

The office action asserts that Evans discloses a request message (column 4, lines 62-64) and indication of content including a specific resource locator (column 5, line 54) and a generic resource locator (column 5, line 47). However, these sections of Evans do not disclose or suggest a request from a first user to share content with a second user comprising both a specific resource locator parameter and a generic resource locator parameter.

Evans recites “The MMCP 202 also sends a request that the retrieval of the multimedia message be deferred 230 (Defer.Ind) to the MMC 206” (column 4, lines 62-64). The request described in this section is a request that, when requested, the multimedia message be retrieved by Evans’ MMC. This is not the same as a request from a first user to share content with a second user. Moreover, nowhere in this section of Evans is a request comprising a specific resource locator parameter **and** a generic resource locator parameter disclosed or suggested.

Evans further discloses in column 5 Evans’ process that “allows a user with a WAP or HTML browser to retrieve a multimedia message”. Evans, column 5, lines 21-22. In this process, Evans’ MMC notifies a known incompatible terminal that a message is available for delivery (column 5, lines 46-49) using an SMS message, and Evans’ MMCP receives a request from the known incompatible terminal requesting the message (column 5, lines 53-56). None of the requests described in the cited sections of Evans are **requests from a first user to share content with a second user**. Moreover, nowhere in the cited sections is a request comprising **a specific resource locator parameter and a generic resource locator parameter** disclosed or suggested.

Because Evans fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 8, 14, 21, and 24, and the configuration of those elements, Evans cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 8, 14, 21, and 24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 8, 14, 21, and 24 under U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants acknowledge that the office action establishes additional grounds for rejection of the remaining claims, all of which are dependent upon claims 1, 8, 14, 21, and 24, either directly or indirectly. However, in view of the amendments and traversals set forth with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 14, 21, and 24, applicants believe that all such dependent claims are in condition for allowance, rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Moreover, applicants submit that the remaining claims recite features that provide a separate basis for patentability. Applicants believe that this response completely and accurately addresses all grounds of rejection. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-35, is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2009

/Aaron F. Bourgeois/
Aaron F. Bourgeois
Registration No. 57,936

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439